which immigrants could be detained and observed in a psychopathic pavilion newly constructed for the purpose. Clarke concludes quite emotionally:

> Those not familiar with the practical side of the subject cannot estimate what it means to protect the coming generations of Canadians from the evil results of the addition of defective and mentally diseased immigrants to our population. Preventive medicine has a duty to perform that cannot be ignored and Federal and Provincial Authorities must unite to fight the threatened evil. Our new law is good as far as it goes, but it does not go far enough, and in many cases we are powerless to act, when our duty seems manifest. It would be so much better too, to intercept the defectives at the port of departure whenever possible. (1907, 9).

A year later, in The Bulletin of the Ontario Hospitals for the Insane, he is more specific about how the inspection could be improved. Besides their being specially trained to detect cases of dementia praecox and other disorders common among immigrants, Clarke emphasizes their youthfulness. Clarke seems to see them almost as plain-clothes policeman as they "mix with the immigrants during the voyage across the ocean and get an idea of their mental status" (20) before they can disembark.[xcvii]

To those who might argue that he is scarifying and exaggerating the "gravity of the situation" (1907, 8), Clarke replies, not very reassuringly, that he is one of those who has been "scanning family histories for many years" and therefore "in a position to speak with authority" (1907, 8). In reality he scarifies even more, connecting dementia praecox and immigration to yet another horrifying plague, hereditary insanity. Attaching to his report for 1908 a chart analyzing the hereditary tendency to insanity in the last year's admissions, Clarke asserts that heredity "is a tremendous factor in the development of insanity" but the statistics on it "have always been compiled in the loosest way" (1908, 6), because physicians are reluctant to ask the customary questions about heredity on the standard form. More serious opposition to the "facts" comes from "friends [who] persistently dodge the telling of family secrets, especially when they have to be recorded in a public document" (1908, 6).

In his report for 1908, Clarke asserts that "the bare facts are suggestive enough; an analysis of them makes us marvel at the complacency of those who